

in the history of ever—can fit into a single football field to a depth of fewer than 10 yards. Now, you compare that with solar panels, for example—solar panels create 300 times more toxic waste than nuclear plants in order to yield the same exact amount of energy—or compare the waste from nuclear power production with wind turbine blades. Wind turbine blades are very hard to recycle, and they usually end up in landfills.

These facts are underreported, but the fact is that solar and wind power do have their own harmful impacts on our environment. There is no free lunch, as you know, and you don't get one now. There are pros and cons of everything.

Solar and wind can't hold a candle to nuclear power when it comes to efficiency. That is just a fact. It takes more than 3 million solar panels or more than 430 wind turbines to produce the same amount of energy as the average nuclear plant. Let me say that again—3 million solar panels, 430 wind turbines to produce the same amount of energy as the average nuclear powerplant. And these numbers do not take into account that solar panels, as we know, are useless when the Sun doesn't shine, and wind turbines are nothing more than expensive paper waste when the wind doesn't blow.

Also underreported, in my judgment, is how safe nuclear energy is. Despite what some people may think, Homer Simpson does not run America's nuclear powerplants. The industry is constantly evolving to make nuclear powerplants safer, to make them more efficient. In fact, we have all read a lot about small modular reactors. I will just use that as an example. These small modular reactors are part of a very promising new generation of advanced reactors that can automatically—automatically—prevent overheating. And, frankly, they produce even less nuclear waste.

Now, I want to be clear. I still believe in fossil fuels. I am an "all of the above" energy advocate, but leading that pack is fossil fuels.

America's economy is the largest in all of human history, and it can't run without oil and gas. Louisianans know this, and most Americans know this. The people of Louisiana serve our country pretty well by contributing to our energy independence, and I am very proud of that.

Last year, Louisiana supplied 9 percent—9 percent—of America's marketed gas. And Louisianans understand, as do, I think, most Americans, that giving up on fossil fuels would not only destroy jobs; it would ruin the economy.

But I want America to use every advantage that it has. I want America to use every energy tool at its disposal. Now, that is why nuclear energy—I see nuclear energy as supporting oil and gas, not replacing it. I want to be clear about that, as supporting oil and gas, not replacing it.

Since nuclear energy holds such promise—and it does—I am hoping that my Democratic friends in Congress and my Republican friends in Congress—because I see this as a bipartisan issue—will lend their full-throated support to nuclear energy.

I am not saying that renewables don't have their proper place in America's energy policy—they certainly do—and I am not saying we should get rid of them—I am certainly not—but we need to acknowledge that renewables have limitations. They have limitations, and nuclear energy does not. There are disadvantages to renewables. As I said, there is no free lunch, and you don't get one now.

Now, for some people, that is a lesson that needs to be repeated. I take note. I say this gently, but the Democratic Party platform, for example, calls for installing 500 million solar panels—500 million solar panels—and 60,000 wind turbines over the next 5 years. This will occupy a lot more land and actually create less energy than building new nuclear reactors. And that is a fact.

Some small modular nuclear reactors are roughly twice the length of the average schoolbus—twice the length of an average schoolbus. Wind farms, on the other hand, can eat up more than 19 square miles. That is about half the size of Disney World—half the size of Disney World, compared to twice the length of the average schoolbus. If we succeed in blanketing our land with solar panels and wind farms, it is going to create more waste, occupy more green space, and ultimately weaken our economy.

Again, I am not saying no to solar and wind. I am not at all. I am saying yes to explore the possibilities of nuclear energy.

President Biden, as we know, has a \$2 trillion infrastructure plan. And I think, if nothing else, his infrastructure plan establishes the Biden administration's priorities. His plan does call for \$61 billion in initiatives that include investments in advanced nuclear technology. I am not sure I agree on the amount, but I like the concept, and I find that to be prudent. But it also asks for three times that amount—\$174 billion—to support electric vehicles, electric cars. I suggest that nuclear energy has more place in energy's future, and it is something that we ought to talk about.

Other spending bonanzas in President Biden's plan include a \$213 billion investment to give 2 million buildings a Green New Deal makeover and \$100 billion to make our schools greener. These are not going to have a more meaningful impact on our environment than exploring nuclear energy. They are just not.

I know that nuclear energy sounds too good to be true, and I don't want to oversimplify the circumstances. Nuclear energy has its drawbacks, but nuclear energy is powerful. Nuclear energy is safe. Nuclear energy is clean.

And by building up our nuclear power capabilities, the United States can create more jobs; the United States can strengthen its economy; and the United States can ensure its place as a world leader on energy. And we can do all that while reducing carbon emissions.

I hope my colleagues will come to embrace nuclear energy as the efficient green energy source that it is and that the U.S. Congress can work with the White House to improve America's standing as an energy juggernaut.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey.

RODRIGUEZ V. PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to express significant concern about the Biden administration's decision to file an amicus brief in the case of Ramona Matos Rodriguez v. Pan American Health Organization.

This case involves serious allegations that the Pan American Health Organization facilitated human trafficking and regrettably places the administration in a position in which it is undercutting efforts by the victims of the Cuban dictatorship's forced labor schemes.

Now, let me be clear, I am a strong advocate for the Pan American Health Organization and its mission strengthening health systems across Latin America and the Caribbean. Given the significant impact of COVID-19 on the region, PAHO's efforts are needed now more than ever, and I have fought to ensure that the Pan American Health Organization has the resources it needs to carry out its lifesaving work during the pandemic and throughout a good period of time of my congressional career. However, I also firmly believe that the Pan American Health Organization must be held accountable for its past transgressions, including the unacceptable role that it played facilitating a program that subjected more than 10,000 Cuban medical professionals to forced labor conditions in Brazil.

From 2013 to 2019, the Pan American Health Organization profited from its participation in Brazil's Mais Medicos Program, an initiative that allowed Cuba's dictatorship to earn income from trafficking doctors.

The Cuban regime's so-called foreign medical missions are nothing more than human trafficking. In November of 2019, the United Nation's Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery and the United Nation's Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons raised concerns that the Cuban regime's trafficking of medical professionals constitutes forced labor and modern slavery.

In fact, the Department of State's last "Trafficking in Persons" report found the Cuban regime garnishes the wages of its medical professionals that serve overseas, surveils them, confiscates their passports so they can't

leave anywhere, and retaliates against family members in Cuba if they leave from the program. So if you send me abroad, don't pay me, get money from the country that you send me from, take away my passport, and retaliate against my family, that is the ultimate forced labor. Cuba's dictatorship generated more than \$6 billion in profit from its forced labor schemes in 2018 alone as it trafficked tens of thousands of Cuban medical professionals to some 60 countries.

The Pan American Health Organization's participation in the Cuban dictatorship's human trafficking programs cannot be overlooked, and accountability is urgently needed.

It is against this backdrop that I have reviewed the Biden administration's amicus brief in *Rodriguez v. Pan American Health Organization*. And while the brief addresses some of the technical aspects of the case, it effectively does nothing—nothing—to condemn Cuba's dictatorship for human trafficking or the Pan American Health Organization's participation in those programs that were human trafficking.

For over two decades, the United States has led the international community in combating human trafficking. In 2000, the United States enacted the Trafficking Victims Protection Act—something I was involved with in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—which has set a standard for countries around the world to strengthen efforts to prosecute traffickers, increase protection for victims, and expand foreign assistance programs. We have built a range of financial tools to combat the human trafficking industry and its illicit profits. We have spearheaded efforts to ensure that slavery-free supply chains—slavery-free supply chains—that respect workers' rights and prevent against forced labor conditions around the world become more and more a reality.

The Biden administration squandered an opportunity in this brief, an opportunity to support Cuban trafficking victims and an opportunity to advance our extraordinary American leadership in combating all forms of human trafficking and modern slavery. It is a major disappointment.

I urge the President and the Secretary of State to redouble efforts to pressure Cuba to end this medical trafficking program and the many other abuses it perpetrates against the Cuban people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. TUBERVILLE pertaining to the introduction of S. 2079

are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. TUBERVILLE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we have been told by the majority party that soon we will be having a vote on an 800-page bill to change 50 State voting laws to 1 Federal law. This bill is called the For the People Act. It was compiled after the 2018 elections to call into question the legitimacy of democratic elections for partisan political purposes.

If it had been a serious attempt at legislating, there would have been some outreach to some Republicans because it takes 60 votes, a bipartisan vote, to get anything through the U.S. Senate.

In that process, there would have been consultation also with local elected officials—the election officials who conduct the State elections—to make sure it was workable. There would have been hearings in the Congress. There would have been revisions from the bill originally introduced.

The fact that back in 2018, when it was introduced, is the fact that it was intended as political propaganda, and that betrays the absurdity of the title, the "For the People Act."

Also, despite Senator SCHUMER's using Senate rule XIV in the last Congress to bypass the committee and put the bill directly on the Senate calendar, Senator SCHUMER never used his right to force a vote on moving to the bill. At that time, the Democratic narrative was that Republicans were not doing enough to secure the election so the results might end up being in doubt. Now, what we know from happening in the last election, that argument is out the window now.

Since the Democrats got the results they wanted, they endlessly quote the Trump administration's top cyber security official declaring the 2020 election the most secure ever in history.

I assumed last Congress that Senator SCHUMER would wait until right before the 2020 election to force a vote so he could accuse Republicans of blocking an election bill for their campaign narrative questioning election security. Instead, they repeatedly, dishonestly, blamed the Republican leader for blocking the bill, ignoring the fact that the Democratic leader had reserved the possibility of forcing a vote.

The For the People Act is a misleading bill. The bill has now been reintroduced and recast as a response to a few State election security laws. A

handful of relatively modern reforms at the State level have been shamelessly and falsely characterized as voter suppression, even considering the fact that in the last election, the winner got the highest number of votes of any winner for President in the history of the United States, and the loser got the highest number of votes of any candidate for President of the United States throughout our history.

As I have mentioned before, the claim by some Trump supporters that a certain brand of voting machine switched votes, I pointed out that that was lifted entirely from the Democrats' 2004 playbook. And President Trump's questioning of his loss in Georgia was simply following in the footsteps of the losing candidate for Governor of Georgia 2 years before. The Georgia Democrat lost by over 50,000 votes in 2018 and has never even bothered to try to prove voting irregularities on that scale.

Foreign adversaries like Russia and China cast doubts on the soundness of our democratic system, both to weaken us from within and to justify their own repressive regimes. American politics should not do these repressive regimes propaganda jobs for them, but too often we tend to be doing that.

This bill is being called democracy reform. I support our American democratic system. All Americans should be proud of it. We can and should have confidence in our elections. Our democracy does not need a fundamental rewrite because our democracy works.

Let's stop casting doubt on American elections, stop casting aspersions on the commonsense election security measures supported by Americans of all backgrounds. Let's work together to boost the confidence of all Americans in our elections.

This bill would register illegal aliens. It would do away with State voter ID laws. It would have taxpayer-funded elections.

I remember what our colleague Senator CRUZ said. In the first quarter of this year, he raised—it must have been in the neighborhood of about \$5 million from contributors of under \$200. So if you get that kind of money, under this bill, from people under \$200, for every dollar you get, you get \$6 from the taxpayers. So Senator CRUZ, I am told, would get about \$34 million of taxpayer funds to use for political purposes. We don't need to replace 50 State voting laws as this 800-page bill would.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, you and I, as we sit on the Rules Committee, saw the debate on this bill—the bill that the sponsors call the For the People Act. I think it really more accurately could be called the "For the Politicians Act." S. 1 was marked up in the Rules Committee last month, a markup that I certainly raised a number of concerns about the bill and others did too. It is more than 800 pages

that contains policies relating to election administration, to campaign finance, to redistricting, and much more.

Now, the truth is, we don't know what bill will come to the floor because this bill couldn't get out of committee. And apparently we are going to not use the committee process but, in fact, we will bring a different bill to the floor that nobody has seen yet. But this bill seems to get bigger over time, not smaller over time.

It includes the overwhelmingly bad idea that Congress should impose a Federal takeover of elections and force a one-size-fits-all approach on the more than 10,000 voting jurisdictions in the country.

There are very few things that you can develop a formula that works just right in 10,000 places. In fact, in our States and in the District of Columbia, we have a pretty significant problem coming up with 51 different structures that work for everywhere in every jurisdiction that is impacted by that.

This bill also has some deadlines that are so short that if it became law, it would create chaos in next year's elections and make the election process less trusted, not more trusted.

We should be focusing on Federal laws and State laws that make it easier to vote and harder to cheat. I think this bill makes it easier to cheat and harder to figure out whether anybody cheated or not.

S. 1 undermines the popular State voter identification laws. The majority of our States now require some kind of identification. And an overwhelming number of voters believe that voter identification at the polls is a good thing.

This bill allows political operatives to fan out across a community and collect an unlimited number of ballots. In fact, it says States can't even stop that process of ballot harvesting. Those ballot harvesters can collect ballots from you. They can collect ballots from your neighbors, from vulnerable voters like people in nursing homes. And, frankly, who knows if they turn them in or not? Who knows if they put them in the post office box or not? If they never show up, the ballot harvester, who may very well know that your ballot is a ballot they don't agree with, could just say, "Well, I don't know what happened. It must have been lost in the mail," and who would ever know whether it was lost in the mail or not?

In addition to undermining voter identification laws and making it possible for complete strangers to take your ballot, S. 1 disrupts States' long-made efforts to maintain an accurate list of eligible voters. Voter rolls are the foundation really of election administration. I was the chief election official in our State. I was a local election official in our State.

Accurate lists of who can vote that people can look at before the election, during the election, and after the election create great confidence in the process.

Accurate lists ensure that voters are able to cast a ballot—and the ballot they should cast—in the districts they actually live in. That can be pretty complicated sometimes, and really only the election authority can be aware of that when they know exactly where you live.

Election officials, when you have accurate lists, know who has voted, and, frankly, they know who hasn't voted. So if the same person comes in or at least a person pretending to be the same person comes in a second time, they know that.

Accurate voter lists allow voters to check in more quickly to get that efficient and quick exercise of democracy done.

One of the things everybody constantly talks about is, well, we make it too hard to vote. If you really want to make it hard to vote, make it hard to figure out who the voters are who are supposed to be voting at a given precinct.

The right to vote is a bedrock principle in our democracy. The right to vote wherever you want to vote is not a bedrock principle in our democracy. You can't just decide: Well, this year I think it is going to be pretty competitive in some other State. I will just drive over there on election day and vote. Frankly, you can't just decide: You know, that congressional district next door to the one I live in looks more competitive than the one I live in. I think I will go over there and vote this year instead of in the district that the census tract would have put me in.

The right to vote is a bedrock principle. The right to vote wherever you want to isn't. Some of our great local administrators figured this out. In St. Louis County, the biggest single election jurisdiction in Missouri, you can vote anywhere in the county, but at the place where you go vote—the ballot for you individually is generated at the place you go vote, and it is counted in the races that are generated for you to vote in. That is pretty innovative. I don't think we could probably have ever figured that out at the national level.

But the point is, you are voting for the people who you are living in the district that person will represent, whether it is on the local school board or in the Congress or in the State legislature. That is a very complicated set of things that benefit totally from voter rolls and benefit from you voting where you live.

This bill prohibits States from putting in place really just reasonable election security measures that have been upheld by court. It takes away the guardrails that prevent fraud from happening and ensures that when you do have fraud, you have ways to figure out that fraud occurred and what to do about it. You pile up all the ways this legislation actually increases the likelihood of fraud, and you think about whether you really need a strong reason to change the system when, as Sen-

ator GRASSLEY said, the system appears to be working pretty well.

Democracies benefit from local responsibility. One political party, however, thinks this bill will give it an electoral advantage. They have thought that for about 20 years. This is the compilation of 20 years of Democrats in the Congress thinking, what could we do to change the election law that would be helpful for us? That is where we are in this legislation. It was written by one party alone. It has been steered through Congress by one party alone. It has not actually been seen by anybody in the other party yet, and the majority leader says this bill, which probably still is going to be about 800 pages, will come to the floor next week. In both Chambers of Congress, there has been bipartisan opposition to the bill and no bipartisan support for this bill.

The danger of those kinds of sweeping changes really can do a lot to negatively impact our election system, but it doesn't stop there. It would turn the Federal Election Commission into a partisan tool where the party of the President has a majority. There is a reason that six-member Commission was equally divided when it was set up, just like there is a reason the Senate Ethics Committee is equally divided.

This bill would send Federal money to campaign coffers at the rate of \$6 for every dollar raised for every contribution under \$200. I think the number my friend Chairman GRASSLEY was talking about was if you raised \$5 million of under \$200, you would get \$30 million from the Federal Government—\$30 million of government money that could clearly be used for something else. In fact, the current Members of the Senate would be eligible under the total restrictions of the bill to get \$1.8 billion in Federal money. Talk about a conflict of interest when you vote for this bill.

The bill also changes redistricting established in the Constitution for the States and basically ensures that all congressional redistricting would be done by Federal courts. That doesn't affect the Senate much, but it affects the government a lot. It places heavy burdens on free speech and impacts every branch of the Federal Government.

I have heard proponents of this bill say that it is necessary to push back recently passed State voter laws and protect the voting rights of Americans. This bill has nothing to do with voting rights. It doesn't protect the right of a single American to cast a ballot. It doesn't bring new people into the system as the constitutional amendment did on women and other people who have been added, people who had been held in a terrible way in slavery, people who had been prevented from voting because of their sex or race, and people who were prevented because of age at one time. This bill does nothing of that.

This is a Federal takeover of elections. It should be rejected by the Senate. I believe it will be rejected by the Senate. We look forward to seeing the other side defend this bill next week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Missouri, Senator BLUNT, for his leadership on this issue.

We had the hearing and the markup in the Rules Committee. I think that we could tell from the debate that the amount of holes and misinformation that is contained within S. 1 is the reason that I call it the so-called For the People Act.

Ronald Reagan famously said that the nine most terrifying words in the English language are "I'm from the government, and I'm here to help." This can be applied to many examples of what we do here.

What seems more pertinent, I think, now is this latest partisan attempt to federalize one of America's most sacred functions, and that is our elections. Advocates claim that this sweeping effort, which comes in the form of legislation ironically called For the People Act, is to get more people to vote. Let's be clear. Everyone—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—we all want to see more people voting. The good news is that we have already been doing that across the country and in my home State of West Virginia.

Remember, last year we were voting under a pandemic, under incredibly difficult situations for everybody. Our State of West Virginia ran a very successful election suited to our State. We had thousands more people vote in 2020 than they did in 2016. In fact, the total number of ballots cast in 2020 was more than any other election in West Virginia's history, with the exception of the 1960 election. The 1960 election, remember, was the Presidential election that President Kennedy won after he had a very successful and a pivotal victory in the primary in West Virginia as the first Roman Catholic running for President. More than 158 million ballots were cast in 2020. That is a 7-percent increase since 2016. This is under a pandemic.

Every State decided the best way to get maximum participation. Last November, every single State saw higher turnout rates compared to the previous Presidential election. If more people are, in fact, voting, what is this Democratic-proposed legislation really about? And that is where it is about the federalization of elections and election power grab. I believe it lacks credibility. It is really about a way to implement absurd and downright un-American provisions in the bill that prioritize power over the will of the people.

I am glad to say that some of my Democratic colleagues are finally acknowledging the concerns with this

bill. During the Rules Committee markup, Republicans and Democrats offered a number of amendments, some of which were adopted on a bipartisan basis. That is what we are supposed to do—work it through committee. These amendments have been heralded by some of my Democratic colleagues as an example of how we can work together on this issue.

Despite the bipartisan amendments in the Rules Committee—despite this—the version that the majority leader may bring up for a vote does not include any of the amendments that were adopted during the markup even though they had bipartisan support. To me, that is a clear sign that the majority is not trying to cooperate in good faith but, rather, trying to ram through a partisan bill that will encroach on the States' abilities—my State's ability—to ensure a free and fair election and a well-attended election at the same time.

The legislation would strip States of their constitutional authority to run elections and allow the Federal Government to determine what is best.

It would ban voter ID laws, which are adopted in many States, mine included, which maintain the integrity of elections in my State and the majority of others. Quite frankly, I haven't heard one person in my State complain about having to take an ID to the polls or to submit an ID with their vote.

The bill would also force States to administer same-day voter registration—a cumbersome mandate that many States won't be able to comply with for dozens of reasons. In my State, it is internet connectivity. Many of our polling areas wouldn't be able to accept same-day registration because they can't connect, unfortunately, to the bigger system to find out if this person is fraudulent or not.

It would also require that States mandate the unpopular and dangerous practice of ballot harvesting, which is ripe for fraud. Now, I will tell you, some States have made ballot harvesting legal. Some States have same-day voter registration. Good for them. They decided what is good for their State through the constitutional duty of States to run elections.

Speaking of fraud, this bill would mandate absentee ballot boxes, drop boxes, and force county clerks to accept regular ballots filed in the wrong precinct without proof of residency, both of which leave the door open to voter fraud.

If that is not enough, if signed into law, West Virginia's e-voting system and others like it—this is the e-voting system that allows our Active military who are deployed overseas to be able to vote safely by their mobile phone, and the legislature opened that up to people with disabilities to be able to use an e-voting system. This bill would severely curtail that and negate it in many cases. That is an expansion of voting rights that this bill would take away.

This legislation would allow government funding of congressional campaigns, with small donations being matched with Federal funds. Now, we heard from our friend Senator CRUZ in our committee. He talked about, if his contributions were matched for the first 3 months of this year, he would get millions of dollars, over \$20 million of public financing for his campaign. I highly doubt my Democratic colleagues would want the Federal Government to help Senator CRUZ in the financing of his campaign. As a matter of fact, he himself, Senator CRUZ, said he doesn't want that at all either.

The bill also would make the FEC, the Federal Election Commission, which oversees our elections and our finances, which is now a neutral three Republicans, three Democrats on the Commission, as it always has been—it would make it into a partisan majority vote. Well, if you are going to be making decisions on my colleague from Florida's election or my election on financials, or the Presiding Officer's election, do we really want a political organization making those? Not when we have had a nonpartisan FEC for years and have enforced our campaign laws and put them above party politics. But remember, this is only about getting people to vote, so don't worry.

The disaster doesn't stop with politicizing the FEC; it would also remove the authority of States to draw district maps and would mandate how you do that. Our States can figure out how best—some of them have commissions. Some of them do it by the legislature. Some of them do it by the supreme court. Let's let the States make that decision.

I just think that the biggest demonstration of opposition to this bill has come from the West Virginia County Clerk's Association. It adopted a resolution in opposition to S. 1 that 54 of the 55 county clerks in my State signed. These are Republican and Democratic county clerks.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter from the West Virginia County Clerk's Association.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 10, 2021.

WVCCA RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE PASSAGE
OF H.R. 1 & S. 1

Whereas, the United States Constitution recognizes the authority of the legislatures of each State to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding federal elections; and

Whereas, election administrators and county officials were not given an opportunity to provide input on the drafting of H.R. 1 and S. 1 prior to the introduction of the legislation, unlike previous bipartisan federal election reforms; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law that currently restricts ballot harvesting for the prevention of fraud, by expressly providing that states "may not put any limit on how many voted and sealed absentee ballots any designated person can return to the post office, a ballot drop-off location, tribally designated building, or election office"; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law by mandating same-day registration, regardless of the severe lack of internet service and broadband in rural areas: an impossible feat in West Virginia; and

Whereas, Same-day registration provisions in H.R. 1 and S. 1 lack proper security protections, multiplied by the lack of internet capability in polling locations in West Virginia, which undermines the integrity of our elections by making it impossible for election officials to confirm any new voter's eligibility prior to them casting any ballot or from guaranteeing that no voter both registers and votes more than once in an election on Election Day; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law by prohibiting requirements for physical proofs of identification for regular in-person and absentee voters, and requiring states to accept just a voter's signature affidavit as proof of eligibility and proper registration; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law and adoption of voting systems by requiring decertification of current, federally certified voting systems, and forcing states to purchase new voting equipment—none of which currently comport with the most recently adopted voluntary voting system guidelines (adopted Feb. 2021 by EAC)—wasting millions of dollars in recent upgrades purchased with HAVA funding across West Virginia and requiring new manufacturing by vendors and purchases by counties to the tune of tens of millions of dollars in WV alone; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 creates multiple so-called “private rights of action” that would lead to election administrators being targeted for lawsuits all across the country for both real and imagined violations, and causing county clerks to spend more time defending themselves in court than preparing to make sure that elections are run smoothly and securely; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 places dozens of additional mandates on county clerks while providing no ongoing operational funding to fulfill the requirements, causing potential cuts in county budgets to law enforcement and public safety; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law by forcing county clerks to accept regular—not provisional—ballots of voters who vote in the incorrect precinct, without sufficient evidence of eligibility or proof of residence; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 fatally contradicts the reliability and security of electronic transmission by permitting voters to cure signature deficiencies electronically (see Sec. 1621) but prohibiting UOCAVA, voters living with disabilities, and first responders called away for service from transmitting absentee ballots securely using extensively tested procedures and methods; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 lump dozens of state agencies and educational institutions into “voter registration agencies,” and requires them to integrate into an automatic voter registration system without regard to current systems, data collection practices, or security creating more opportunities for voters' registrations to be mishandled and mistransmitted, and likely resulting in security lapses for agencies currently not covered under the Critical Infrastructure designation of the Department of Homeland Security; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law by mandating new dates for the early in-person voting period without regard to state-specific success and voter participation under current election calendars; and

Whereas, H.R. 1 and S. 1 preempt state law by requiring absentee ballot drop boxes and increasing security concerns for absentee ballots that currently do not exist under state laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the West Virginia County Clerk's Association opposes the passage of H.R. 1, S. 1, or any other legislation that impedes the state's ability to administer elections in an overreaching, one-size-fits-all approach out of Washington D.C.

Adopted the 10th day of June, 2021 in Canaan Valley, WV
Expires: June 2026

CONNIE KAUFMAN,
Barbour Co. Clerk.
ROGER TONEY,
Boone Co. Clerk.
ELAINE C. MAUCK,
Berkeley Co. Clerk.
SUE ANN RUTHERFORD,
Braxton Co. Clerk.
KIM BARBETTA,
Brooke Co. Clerk.
JEAN SIMERS,
Calhoun Co. Clerk.
CATEE SLATER,
Doddridge Co. Clerk.
JEAN BUTCHER,
Gilmer Co. Clerk.
ROBIN LOUDERMILK,
Greenbrier Co. Clerk.
GEORGE FOLEY,
Hancock Co. Clerk.
JOHN SPIRES,
Harrison Co. Clerk.
JACQUELINE C. SHADLE,
Jefferson Co. Clerk.
CYNTHIA S. ROWAN,
Lewis Co. Clerk.
JOHN A. TURNER,
Logan Co. Clerk.
PHYLLIS SMITH,
Cabell Co. Clerk.
CONNIE WORKMAN,
Clay Co. Clerk.
MICHELLE Z. HOLLY,
Fayette Co. Clerk.
BUD FISHER,
Grant Co. Clerk.
ERIC W. STRITE,
Hampshire Co. Clerk.
GREGORY L. ELY,
Hardy Co. Clerk.
CHERYL A. BRIGHT,
Jackson Co. Clerk.
VERA MCCORMICK,
Kanawha Co. Clerk.
DIREL G. BAKER,
Lincoln Co. Clerk.
JULIE KINCAID,
Marion Co. Clerk.
JAN PEST,
Marshall Co. Clerk.
DONALD L. HICKS,
McDowell Co. Clerk.
LAUREN ELLIFRITZ,
Mineral Co. Clerk.
DONALD J. EVANS,
Monroe Co. Clerk.
ROBERT PAINTER,
Nicholas Co. Clerk.
ELISE M. WHITE,
Pendleton Co. Clerk.
MELISSA BENNETT,
Pocahontas Co. Clerk.
BRIAN WOOD,
Putnam Co. Clerk.
BRENDA WISEMAN,
Randolph Co. Clerk.
DIANA N. CROMLEY,
Mason Co. Clerk.
VERLIN T. MOYE,
Mercer Co. Clerk.
LARRY CROAFF,
Mingo Co. Clerk.
KIMBERLY NICKLES,
Morgan Co. Clerk.
MICHAEL E. KELLY,
Ohio Co. Clerk.
EVELYN DAVIS,
Pleasants Co. Clerk.
LINDA HUGGINS,

Preston Co. Clerk.
DANNY MOORE,
Raleigh Co. Clerk.
TRACIE McDONALD,
Ritchie Co. Clerk.
CHARLES B. WHITE, JR.,
Roane Co. Clerk.
GEORGIANNA THOMPSON,
Taylor Co. Clerk.
NEIL ARCHER,
Tyler Co. Clerk.
RENICK C. BOOTH,
Wayne Co. Clerk.
CAROL HAUGHT,
Wetzel Co. Clerk.
MARK RHODES,
Wood Co. Clerk.
MARY B. MERRITT,
Summers Co. Clerk.
SHERRY SIMMONS,
Tucker Co. Clerk.
CAROL SMITH,
Upshur Co. Clerk.
EVA R. GREEN,
Webster Co. Clerk.
MAROLYN BALDRIGE,
Wirt Co. Clerk.
JEWELL AGUILAR,
Wyoming Co. Clerk.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, they raise numerous grievances, many of which I have talked about. They talk about the voting machines they have right now, which they have spent a lot of money on, that would all be taken offline. You would have to fully replace all of that. They also fully reject the usurping of what is their constitutionally based responsibility to run elections safely, securely, and on time. So I appreciate the letter from our clerks and certainly understand their deep, deep concerns. The right to vote is a constitutional right, and on that, we are in agreement.

I got to go to a citizenship ceremony wherein 20 new citizens joined our country after having waited to get into our country. After becoming citizens, the best and most precious right they get is that right to vote. Yet S. 1 is merely a partisan power grab that includes all kinds of unrelated, harmful provisions. It strips the States of their authority to run their elections. To put it simply, States do not need the Federal Government to strip them of their authority and impose burdensome requirements to fix problems that do not exist. That is exactly what this bill does, and it is why the For the People Act does not live up to its name.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, the United States is a beacon of democracy in the world, and our Nation was founded on free and fair elections, but if the American people don't have confidence in our elections, we don't have a sustainable democracy.

Right now, unfortunately, many people do not have confidence. People across the country are mad when they look at the blatant power grab by the Democrats to fundamentally change our democracy. Do you know what? They should be mad. We are talking about the sacred right to vote.

If we want to continue as a thriving democracy, we have to take action so

that Americans trust in free and fair elections. That is why I introduced the Save Democracy Act so as to restore faith in our Federal elections and guarantee that voters decide the outcomes of elections, not the courts.

I also introduced the Promoting Election Integrity by Proving Voter Identity Act so as to require voter ID. It is pretty simple. If you want to vote in person, you will need to bring your current and valid ID. If you want to vote by mail, you will need to provide a copy of your ID. Like I said, it is pretty simple and straightforward. If we want, and we do—we want 100 percent participation in our elections, and we want zero fraud. We want it to be easy to vote and very hard to cheat. Voter ID helps us meet that goal.

Of course, the Democrats will do anything to fight against these commonsense reforms. Instead, the Democrats are pushing S. 1, otherwise known as the Corrupt Politicians Act. S. 1 is the most ridiculous legislation I have seen since I have come to the Senate. I would need hours to go through all of it. For our purposes here today, I want to highlight just one piece of this lunacy: using taxpayer dollars to pay for political campaigns.

The Democrats want to use your tax dollars to subsidize their political campaigns. Think about how anti-democratic it is to allow public servants to use the people's money to manipulate the people themselves. Just to be crystal clear, here is what is exactly being proposed by the Democrats in this anti-democratic bill: Public officials—the government—take money from you. Then they use that money to pay for their campaign ads in order to manipulate you.

This bill is nothing but a political power grab by Washington Democrats. New Hampshire Democrat Secretary of State Bill Gardner even said recently that S. 1 was a power grab by the Federal Government that would “trample New Hampshire's state constitution.”

Under the Democrats' plan, a candidate for the Senate in California could spend \$80 million in taxpayer dollars to run attack ads and fund his campaign—\$80 million. In Georgia, a Senate candidate could get as much as \$25 million in taxpayer money. Candidates in Arizona could get almost \$19 million. New York candidates would get more than \$44 million. That doesn't make any sense.

What kind of return on investment are the American people getting when their hard-earned tax dollars are funding attack ads? Why is the Federal Government in the business of funding campaigns? Because my Democratic colleagues want the government to take your money and spend it on trying to manipulate your vote.

Only in Washington would a bunch of politicians look at the challenges from recovering from the pandemic and decide the most important thing we can do is make taxpayers fund campaign ads.

This is the most radical piece of voting legislation this Nation has ever seen at a time when restoring confidence in our elections has never been more important.

I was sent to the U.S. Senate to fight for Floridians and Americans against corrupt politicians. Here is my promise to every American family: I am going to fight every day to make sure the Democrats do not try to take your money to manipulate your vote.

If we are serious about working together to move our country forward, restore public trust in our elections, and protect democracy, we need to reject the insanity of S. 1 and look to commonsense reforms like voter ID. We will continue to fight the Democrats' election power grab and combat their efforts to prevent measures that protect the integrity of our elections.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, it has been so interesting to talk with Tennesseans over the past couple of weeks, and it is interesting in the vein that they are beginning to really question some of the proposals that my Democratic colleagues are bringing forward and items that they are pushing from the left side of the aisle.

I have to tell you that I honestly can't blame them. After all, when they promised COVID relief, they delivered a blue State bailout, which was something that was not popular in Tennessee. They said that they were going to be all for some much needed infrastructure projects. In Tennessee, we like to talk about this in terms of roads and railways and runways and rivers. Yet what did the people from Tennessee hear? They heard all about the Green New Deal, they heard about incentives for electric vehicles, and they heard about alternative energy. They looked at that infrastructure bill and said: This is fantasyland.

Then, when they promised to support families and children, what did you get from the left side of the aisle? You got support for expanding the welfare state.

Now Senate Democrats have promised to vote on legislation that they claim is going to make our elections more transparent. Hmm. That is interesting. Surprising no one, the bill the Democrats are trying to sell to the American people will do exactly the opposite.

Of course, in typical fashion of the House, what did it do? It gave it a friendly sounding name—the For the People Act—but in actuality, this is a bill that would take away rights and responsibilities from the American people.

They are saying: This is going to be about transparency. Well, when we think of transparency, we think of things that are going to be seen, of things that are going to be easily understood. We think of things from which the activity within is going to be

made available so that people can see this. It should follow, then, that a bill that is promising transparent elections would be there to help voters understand the rules, trust the people in charge, and cast their votes of confidence. It would not be a bill that would seize control from local officials and place it in the hands of unelected Washington bureaucrats, and it would not be a bill that would make it literally impossible to stand up polling places. It certainly would not be a bill that would erode confidence in ballot integrity, but that is what we have. It just doesn't make sense what they are trying to do when it comes to voting.

Even with all of this, my Democratic colleagues have spent most of this year trying to sell the American public on a bill that would centralize power, that would impose burdensome rules on State and local governments, and that would take away constitutional responsibilities and rights and all but ensure rampant voter fraud. That is correct. A piece of legislation that would do—what?—make it easier to cheat.

So, in the interest of the transparency my Democratic colleagues have promised, let's take a closer look at the legislation they are pushing forward.

Like most proposals they have tried to force through this year, this latest, brazen political power grab is built on a foundation of unreasonable mandates—mandates from the Federal Government to the State and local governments. Yet, rather than simplifying the process, these new rules would throw your local elections into chaos.

If passed, the provisions in this bill would mandate the use of ballot casting technology and voter registration systems that don't even exist yet. That is correct. What is being mandated is not in existence, but when it does come to exist, you can bet that it will cost a fortune, that it will come with a steep learning curve, and that there will be buddies of the Democratic Party that will make a bucket of money.

The same automatic registration procedures that failed voters in California and Illinois will fail voters in every State in this country.

It would force States to stand aside for activists running ballot harvesting schemes—and, indeed, ballot harvesting is a scheme. Anyone who has ever watched one of these campaigns in action knows that forcing officials to tolerate them is an invitation for these activists to engage in a little sleight of hand, if you will.

In fact, this bill truly outdoes itself when it comes to encouraging fraud. Its hallmark provision would ban meaningful voter ID laws and stop State and local officials from cleaning up their voter rolls. This bill strips away every commonsense defense against voter fraud.

It would also inject fear into the process by mandating donor disclosure and weaponizing a partisan FEC against minority political parties.

The American people know there is only one reason you would work this hard to remove transparency from elections: They are seeking to remove transparency from the voter. Truth be told, many of my colleagues across the aisle know it, too, which is why this bill has earned bipartisan opposition.

I have spent the better part of 2 years coming to the floor to object to various iterations of this bill, and I will continue to do so until my colleagues abandon this partisan power grab.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I am joining others who have the same problem with what the majority party here in the U.S. Senate is trying to do. It is something that surprises a lot of people, something that would completely revamp, completely change, a system that has been in place since 1787.

I understand that they are soon going to be forcing a vote on a bill they are naming the For the People Act, and it is anything but for the people.

For those unfamiliar, this is a Democrat bill to nationalize our elections and to give Washington unprecedented and unconstitutional power over States and local governments.

Each speaker, including myself, who has spoken so far has been jealously guarding their system because we have put into place a very safe and honest way of handling our elections.

Now, keep in mind, this bill is not new. House Democrats passed this back in 2019, right on party-line votes. In fact, the only bipartisan aspect of the bill is its opposition, as was just stated by another speaker.

Back in March, along with every single House Republican, one brave House Democrat voted against this bill, and the reason is clear—and it has been stated—but let me put all five of these things into one area so that it is a little easier to understand.

The bill is filled with dangerous, anti-democratic provisions—provisions that make it easier to steal votes.

One, legalizing ballot harvesting. Each Member has been talking about ballot harvesting and the threat that is out there.

Banning voter ID. In my State of Oklahoma, we have ID laws to safeguard our votes.

They are attempting to restore felons' right to vote. Why would you want to restore a felon's right to vote? And I have not heard anyone yet give a good argument that is persuasive.

Allowing voters to cast ballots outside of their precincts. That is just one step further and one step easier to falsify ballots.

Subsidize political candidates with Federal funds. We are going to talk about that. It is unbelievable. I mentioned some of the—how it might affect some individuals.

It is more accurately named the "For the Liberal Politicians Act." In their mind, it not only ensures that they can

control elections forever with ballot harvesting and other questionable practices, but they would also give millions in taxpayers' funds to bulk up their campaigns.

I just reminded them, and others have mentioned this, too, it sounds like you might be criticizing TED CRUZ when you say this, but it is not because he knows it is wrong. He observed that—when he was running for office, that if he had been able to harvest the opportunities you have from the Federal Government, he would have raised some \$24 million in Federal funds in the first quarter of this year for his campaign.

The Oklahoma State Election Board Secretary, Paul Zirix, shared with me his strong concerns about this bill and what it would do to my State of Oklahoma and our election integrity laws. It would impose policies that contradict State law, like legalizing ballot harvesting and preventing voter ID for in-person voting.

As he is responsible for managing the elections in Oklahoma, he knows how bad this would be for Oklahomans.

Today, Oklahoma's elections are safe, secure, and fair. Secretary Zirix said it best in 2019, when he testified before the House, that Oklahoma's voting system is "one of the most reliable, most accurate, most secure, most efficient, most cost-effective, and speediest voting system in the entire world."

We pride ourselves on that. That is Oklahoma doing it, not the Federal Government—not the Federal Government doing something that might benefit one segment of our society.

It is clear the Democrats are playing politics with S. 1.

Now, following the 2020 Presidential election, Democrats complained about efforts to remove States from running their elections, but now Democrats are seeking sweeping Federal control over elections.

I am going to mention something that no one has mentioned before, and I guess the only reason it comes to my mind is I have been doing this for a long period of time—being concerned in trying to preserve our electoral college.

Back in 1787, we had a problem. They were putting together a Constitution to try to establish a way of voting in the United States of America that would be safe for everyone and be equitable.

And so they came out and—they didn't want to do it just on a one-person vote because if you do that, that is a decided advantage for all of the large States. And so what they did was come up with what they called the electoral college, and that was that they made the effort to correct the problem. We are talking about back in 1787.

In 1787, we had a system where we had four very large States and nine small States. So if you just—the four large States were comprised of more than 50 percent of the electorate so that wouldn't work. That wasn't going

to work. And, of course, the same thing is true today. Today, nine States have a majority of the votes.

And so it was the clear intent not to let the large States have control of our system.

Now, I am sure some of the large States disagree with that. Some Democrats—a lot of Democrats disagree with that because it would be a decided advantage in an interim election.

So what we did, we established the electoral college, and I have committed that is my main cause right now because it is in jeopardy now. The electoral college is being attacked on a regular basis.

In fact, one of the prominent Democrats who is currently in the leadership in the Democratic Party has introduced a resolution to do away with the electoral college. That is something we cannot allow to happen.

And, oddly enough, it has survived for, what, 233 years now—233 years. And yet, it has survived all that time, but there are those attacking it right now.

So that is another one of the major issues that we are concerned with, and that is that we are not only giving up all the creativity and the safeguards that are in a secure system, put together not by the Federal Government but by the States, and trying to take that over for the Federal Government. They have been attempting to do this, now, for 230 years. They haven't been successful, and I am hoping they will not be successful on my watch.

Thank you.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, if H.R. 1, S. 1 were ever passed into law, it would forever be known as the "Nancy Pelosi Power Grab Act."

This legislation lets the Federal Government take over our elections, which is clearly unconstitutional.

Let's talk about ballot harvesting to begin with. Most Americans believe that ballot harvesting is wrought with fraud and wrong. Frankly, it dilutes your vote.

For decades, for centuries, Americans have woken up early in the morning on voting day to get to church, to vote early before they get to work.

Can you just imagine how much seeing so many show up with a bag full of ballots, which can't be vouched for—what it does to devalue your vote.

Let's talk about voter ID for a second. I think most Americans—maybe at least 80 percent of Americans—believe that voter ID brings integrity to the election process.

Certainly voter ID has worked for Kansas for years and brings about integrity to our election process. Just think about all the things that require an ID at this point in time. To rent a car today, if I wanted to check into a hotel, if I wanted to board an airplane tonight, I would need some type of identification.

And I think the value of voting is even more than any of those and thus the need for some type of voter identification. This bill takes integrity out of the election process.

Next, most Americans don't want their tax dollars going to fund any elections, especially elections of the opposite party to which you belong, and I can certainly guarantee that nobody wants to see more political attack ads with their hard-earned tax dollars being spent.

But let me tell you what I am for. I want to make it easier to vote and harder to cheat. I want to make it easier to vote and harder to cheat.

Ballot harvesting makes it easier to cheat. Getting rid of voter ID makes it easier to cheat. That destroys the integrity of the election process.

This bill, simply stated, is just another attempt at an unconstitutional power grab.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam President, today we are discussing S. 1, the so-called For the People Act.

Now, this legislation takes a system that is actually working quite well and applies drastic, draconian, and desperate election reforms meant to keep Democrats in power.

Now, why do I say the current system is working well? Well, let me tell you just how easy it is back home in my home county of Johnson County, IN, to cast one's vote.

You see, beginning 4 weeks before the election, you can vote early in person, with no excuses, Monday through Friday, for at least 8 hours per day. The two Saturdays before the election, early voting was open for 7 hours each day. Monday, the day before the election, early voting was open for 3½ additional hours. And then on election day, polls were open for 12 hours. In total, that is 201½ hours of voting across 23 days, over a period of 4 weeks.

In total, you see, we afford Hoosiers plenty of opportunity to vote.

And lest you think that my suburban county is somehow unique in the State of Indiana, let me disabuse you of that notion. In neighboring Indianapolis, they had 221 hours of early voting over that same period.

Additionally, Hoosiers have the ability to vote absentee. Now, you can vote absentee in the State of Indiana by mail for 11 separate reasons, including being sick or caring for someone who is sick or working on election day.

Now, colleagues, in the history of our country, voting has never been easier than it is right now. That is right. You may not see this in the media, but this is indeed true.

You see, the truth bears it out right in the numbers. Last year, a larger percentage of the population voted than they had in any election since 18-year-olds were given the right to vote 50 years ago. A larger proportion of the population voted than it had since over the last 50 years.

Why aren't we hearing this?

According to the Census Bureau, voter turnout for African Americans and Hispanic Americans were up 3 and 6 percent, respectively, not down. Asian Americans saw a huge 10-percent increase. This is fantastic.

Yet my colleagues on the left would have the American people believe that we are living in an era of extreme suppression or, as President Biden demagogically, dishonestly, and divisively called it, "Jim Crow on steroids."

So what exactly is the national Democratic response to this record turnout?

Well, they would like to strip election powers away from the States, States like Indiana, and give those powers to Democratic overlords here in Washington, DC. That is how we ended up with S. 1, the For the People Act.

So for the folks back home, what is this For the People Act really all about? Why are we having this debate? Why are we going to have this vote? It is really about four things—four things.

One, national Democrats want to fund their campaigns with your taxpayer dollars. That is right. Under the For the People Act, a \$100 campaign donation to NANCY PELOSI could be matched by \$600 from taxpayers.

I don't know about, you know, my colleagues who are listening, but my neighbors work very hard for their wages and salaries, and I expect that is the case for them as well. They don't want \$600 to match \$100 given to NANCY PELOSI.

Two, national Democrats want to gut popular voter ID laws, like those in the State of Indiana. I know what Hoosiers believe. Hoosiers believe you should have to prove who you are in order to vote. Our voter ID law, incidentally, passed in 2005. It was challenged in the courts, and it was upheld in the Supreme Court of the United States by a vote of 6 to 3.

But this bill, this For the People Act, says you don't have to prove who you are. You don't have to prove you are who you say you are in order to cast your vote. We will just take you at your word. That seems to me to be ripe for abuse.

No. 3, the third thing this is all about is that national Democrats want to allow ballot harvesting. It is an awful word, and it is an awful thing—the harvesting of ballots. In Indiana, a member of your household can already turn in your absentee ballot. You can do it. But under this law, anybody can turn in your ballot—or not turn it in—and there is no limit as to how many ballots a single person can turn in—hundreds of ballots, thousands of ballots. It is ripe for abuse.

The final thing this is about is that national Democrats want to take control of the Federal Election Commission. They want to turn it into a partisan committee.

Now, everyone in this body believes that the right to vote is sacred. It is a

sacred right that all of us have, and we ought to be able to exercise it unhindered and with fidelity. We are in this Chamber because each one of our respective constituents exercised their right to vote. That is how we earned our election certificates, and we all agree that our constituents need to be able to trust the systems in place that allowed them to cast their vote.

So we can't take that sacred right and turn it into a partisan exercise, as S. 1 proposes we do. That, my friends, is why this Senator will be voting no on S. 1, the so-called For the People Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, in each new Congress, the bill number S. 1 is a sign of the majority's priority legislation. It says a lot about the new Democrat majority that the bill they chose to design as S. 1 prioritizes themselves.

This bill creates a Federal campaign fund to finance the expenses of candidates for Congress. Instead of addressing the important issues that are on the minds of my fellow Iowans—like the rising cost of gasoline, bread, milk, and all sorts of household goods—this bill literally takes money out of the paychecks of working Americans and puts it into the campaign coffers of Washington politicians.

Rather than helping to get Americans back to work, the Democrats' top priority, again, is S. 1. Their top priority is to create a Federal jobs program for political consultants and pollsters, taxpayer-subsidized robocalls interrupting your family dinner, junk mail cluttering your mailbox, and attack ads blaring—yes—on your TV. And, folks, you cannot—cannot—unsubscribe, either, because there is no opting out.

Think about the politician you dislike the most. Now imagine your tax dollars funding their ads and fliers and campaign parties and rallies. That is what this bill does.

That is right. The bill subsidizes politicians' campaigns—your tax dollars helping to elect politicians who oppose your values.

This idea is so unpopular that a New York poll found that the majority leader's own constituents oppose public funding of campaigns by a 3-to-1 margin.

While the Democrats call the bill the For the People Act, a more apt title would be "Fund the Politicians Act." It is about Washington politicians—the same ones who just brought back earmarks to pay for their pet pork projects with your tax dollars, prioritizing themselves.

The bill not only subsidizes the campaigns of politicians, it nationalizes elections. Washington would tell the rest of the country how you can select your representatives. It does so by creating a Federal workaround of State voter ID laws by effectively eliminating the enforcement of State ID requirements at the polls.

Think about what you are required to show an ID to do: drive a car, board a plane, buy a beer—and the list goes on. But Democrats think it is best if we don't require an ID to vote.

The majority of Americans disagree with Washington Democrats, and 77 percent of voters support voter ID. A little known fact is that this includes support by 63 percent of Democrats and a vast majority of Black and Hispanic voters.

It is all part of the Democrats' larger scheme and total power grab to tilt our political system in their favor. First, eliminate the filibuster. Then, rig elections by eliminating election integrity laws like voter ID verification. Then, add new States, like the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, that will elect Democrat Senators. And don't forget the plan to pack the Court.

There are just 50 Democratic Senators, but 60 votes are required to end debate on legislation in the Senate. Therefore, the Democrats must eliminate the filibuster in order to pass S. 1, their priority legislation. That is right—changing the rules in order to fundamentally change our country.

And I would remind folks that my friends across the aisle are seeking to abolish the very same tool—the filibuster—that they used 327 times last year alone when they were in the minority. If they chose to change the rules, they would destroy this Chamber's long, proud history as being the world's greatest deliberative body.

The Senate's current assistant majority leader made it clear—very clear—in 2018, in no uncertain terms, that ending the filibuster would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to the Founding fathers.

Because the takeover of elections is just as radical and largely unconstitutional, the Democrats' Court-packing scheme is another key component of enshrining S. 1.

Folks, we can all see this for what it is—a transparent play for permanent political power. This is not about democracy. It is about changing the rules and tipping the scales to favor Washington Democrats.

As a former local elections commissioner, I believe elections are always best kept at the State and local level, and I will continue to push back on my colleagues' attempts to federalize our elections system.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

NOMINATION OF RADHIKA FOX

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I rise today to urge our colleagues to join me in voting to confirm Radhika Fox—Isn't that a great name, Radhika Fox?—to be Assistant Administrator for Water of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Over the past 2 months, as Radhika Fox has gone through the confirmation process, I have had the real pleasure to come to know her and, frankly, to ad-

mire her. I am convinced that she is an excellent choice to lead the EPA's Office of Water at a crucial time in the Agency's history.

Ms. Fox brings with her an impressive, professional record of service and accomplishment spanning over two decades, working on water issues at the local, State, and Federal level.

Most recently, before she was nominated for her position at EPA, Ms. Fox served as the CEO of the U.S. Water Alliance. There she worked hand-in-glove with organizations across this country representing a wide range of water stakeholders, from industries to municipalities, from service organizations to consumer groups, and from agricultural groups to environmental organizations. What those organizations have said again and again about Radhika Fox is that she is an exceptional leader who will work day and night to come up with practical solutions for our country's serious water challenges. Moreover, Ms. Fox will make sure that everyone's point of view is heard and taken into account when EPA acts to protect our country's precious water resources.

And how do we know these groups say all these wonderful things about Radhika Fox? Because they have written to us, urging the Senate to act swiftly to confirm her, again and again and again. In fact, over 80 prominent organizations that are key stakeholders in the nation's water policies have written letters in support of her nomination to this important post.

When I say that over 80 organizations have written, I don't mean that 80-plus organizations have signed on to a common letter—one letter of support. No, no, no. I mean that over 80 organizations have taken the time to write their own unique, thoughtful letters of support.

In fact, the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works, which I am privileged to lead along with SHELLEY CAPITO of West Virginia, has been inundated with letters of support for Radhika Fox. Each letter describes the specific and positive impact that Ms. Fox has already had on issues of importance to those individual organizations and the members of those they represent, and she has done it under previous professional positions consistently.

I will take a few minutes. I don't do this very often, but I just want to take a few minutes here and actually go through some of these letters, these 80 letters of support. They are remarkably consistent letters of great compliment and praise for her and the kind of person she is and the kind of leader that she is. But I want to share the words of some of those who reached out to us.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce writes:

Ms. Fox has worked to ensure that businesses and the groups that represent them are valued stakeholders in water infrastructure conversations. She has created plat-

forms to convene stakeholders from the water sector and industry through her leadership.

The U.S. Water Alliance, what do they say? The U.S. Water Alliance writes:

Radhika Fox developed a consistent record of working cooperatively alongside stakeholders from every corner of the water sector, including drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater utilities of all sizes, environmental groups, labor, frontline communities, and countless others.

How about the Family Farm Alliance. Here is what the Family Farm Alliance writes:

Due to her extensive engagement in policy and public discourse in her previous positions, Ms. Fox understands the implications of guidance and regulation but also the importance of authentic community engagement and the need to achieve quantified results on the ground.

They go on to say:

Radhika Fox is the type of leader to create the conditions to catalyze that work and ultimately see it through.

Again, those are the words we received from the Family Farm Alliance.

How about the Iowa Soybean Association? We raise a lot of soybeans in our State, and I know the Presiding Officer raises a bunch in her State. And for this gentleman sitting over here on my left, they raise a few down in West Virginia. But the Iowa Soybean Association says:

Ms. Fox understands how water management issues are interwoven with the fabric of rural and urban communities and that farmers must be part of the team and beneficiaries of this work. This integration is key for making real and long-lasting progress on protecting and improving water in the 21st century.

And here are some words from one of our neighbors in Delaware, off to the west of us, Maryland. Ben Grumbles, a Republican-appointed secretary of the Maryland's Department of the Environment writes that Ms. Fox has "impressed public and private sector water leaders on her abilities to find common ground and skillfully advocate for integrated 'One Water' policies throughout the country. . . . Radhika is well-qualified to organize, inspire, and lead EPA's national water program and the many diverse constituencies who shape our water future.

Thank you for those words, Ben Grumbles.

Galveston. Galveston, TX, here we go. Galveston Bay Foundation down in Galveston, TX, says this about Radhika:

Radhika is a proven leader who has demonstrated a desire to make sure that all stakeholders and all voices have a place at the table.

And, finally, last but not least, the Community Water Center—that is an outfit in Central California, not too far from where I was stationed when I was in the Navy. They write:

Ms. Fox has the rare ability to bring multiple differing voices into the room (from environmental justice to water agencies to agricultural entities to state government leaders), find the common themes, and then